



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/683,728	10/09/2003	Wei Sun	03226.475001; P8956	1630
32615	7590	10/17/2008	EXAMINER	
OSHA LIANG L.L.P./SUN TWO HOUSTON CENTER 909 FANNIN, SUITE 3500 HOUSTON, TX 77010			OKORONKWO, CHINWENDU C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2436	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/17/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docketing@oshaliang.com
lord@oshaliang.com
hathaway@oshaliang.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/683,728	Applicant(s) SUN ET AL.	
	Examiner CHINWENDU C. OKORONKWO	Art Unit 2436	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 June 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 27-47 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 27-47 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. In response to communications filed on 06/27/2008, the Examiner acknowledges the amendments made to the claims and have both considered and applied them to the claims.

Response to Remarks/Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to the rejection of claims 27-47 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

2.1 In response to Applicant argument that the Examiner attempting to equate the "cookie disclosed in Cheng to artifacts of the amended claims" the Examiner respectfully disagrees, reminding the Applicant that in the previous response to arguments of 03/27/2008, the Examiner responded "In response to Applicant argument that the Cheng and Botz references **do not teach or suggest artifacts as recited** in the claims, the Examiner respectfully disagrees citing column1 lines 47-50 – "user-specific information ... personal data ... pertaining to a user" and column 1 lines 52-60 **which specifically recites user information (artifacts)** such as "credit card information, street address, telephone number, social security number, bank details, personal health information, taxation data, criminal records, etc. from one sever to another." The Examiner further cites column 2 lines 5-12 of Cheng – "conveying access

Art Unit: 2136

control information ... identification, authentication, authorization and privilege information from one network device to another network device through an end user device” and column 5 line 66 – column 6 line 2 which recites, “a single MDSSO cookie provides access to all the URLs of a domain ... each cookie can provide access to particular resources available at a network device.” The Examiner submits that from the above quotation and citation it is clear that *the user information* of Cheng is being equated to the claimed *artifacts*. The Examiner respectfully emphasizes that the disclosed cookie of Cheng has not been equated to the claimed artifacts of the instant Application. Thus, based upon the arguments provided by the Examiner in the previous response, which the Applicant has not responded to, the 102(e) and 103(a) rejections are maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 27-31, 33-35, 37-38, 40-45 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

as being disclosed by Cheng et al. (U.S. Patent 7,010,582 B1 *hereinafter*

Cheng).

[Examiner's Reasoning: The Examiner understands the disclosed "servers" of column 10 line 19 – column 11 line 12, to read upon the claimed multiple "applications" (first application, second application, etc.) as these "applications" are functioning as servers and performing the duties or services of a server. Anyone skilled in the art would understand the disclosed "applications" to be the software or applications which operate(s) servers, such as the servers disclosed by Cheng et al.]

Regarding claim 27, Cheng et al., discloses a method for managing access to a plurality of applications using a central server, comprising:

- receiving a user name and a user password of a user from a first application (col.1 lines 47-50 – "user-specific information ... personal data ... pertaining to a user");
- authentication the user using the user name and password (col. 6 lines 53-59 – "the authentication front end 22, after successful validation, generates an MDSSO cookie and sends this back to the user in the header portion of a message which also redirects the user's browser to access the server's MDSSO function 24");
- generating, in response to the successful authentication, identity assertion information comprising information associated with the user for use by a plurality of applications to authenticate the user (col. 2 lines 12-36 –

“network device in response to this message from the end user device sends a response message to the end user device containing the access control information to be conveyed to the another network device”);

- generating a first artifact associated with the identity assertion information, wherein the first artifact is used to obtain the identity assertion information (col. 1 lines 52-60 – “sending credit card information, street address, telephone number, social security number, bank details, personal health information, taxation data, criminal records, etc. from one sever to another”);
- sending the first artifact to the first application (col. 1 lines 52-60 – “sending credit card information, street address, telephone number, social security number, bank details, personal health information, taxation data, criminal records, etc. from one sever to another”);
- receiving the first artifact and a request for the identity assertion information from a second application, wherein the second application receives the first artifact from the first application (col. 2 lines 12-36 – “network device in response to this message from the end user device sends a response message to the end user device containing the access control information to be conveyed to the another network device”);

[Examiner's Reasoning: The Examiner understands the disclosed network devices to comprise a plurality of network devices as suggested and specified by the claims of Cheng (claims 25-28).]

- verifying the validity of the first artifact upon receipt from the second application (col. 6 lines 53-59 – “the authentication front end 22, after successful validation, generates an MDSSO cookie and sends this back to the user in the header portion of a message which also redirects the user’s browser to access the server’s MDSSO function 24”);
- retrieving, after successful validation of the first artifact, the identity assertion information for the user using the first artifact (col. 1 lines 52-60 – “sending credit card information, street address, telephone number, social security number, bank details, personal health information, taxation data, criminal records, etc. from one sever to another”); and
- receiving a request for a second artifact from the second application and sending the identity assertion information to the second application, wherein the second application uses the identity assertion information to authorize the user to access the second application (col. 5 lines 4-15 – “response message being adapted to cause the end user device to send a second message to the another network device containing at least part of the user-specific information after presenting an option to the end user device the second message has a header portion and a content portion and the second message contains the at least part of the user specific information embedded within its content portion”);

- rendering the first artifact invalid for future use by any of the plurality of applications (col. 7 lines 9-11 – “the cookie may also have an expiry date”); and
- receiving a request for a second artifact from the second application (col. 10 lines 42-46 – “causing the browser to send a request message to Server_2 ... [t]he MDCB 108 on SERVER_2 is capable of extracting the data from the request”) and
- providing the second artifact associated with the identity assertion information, wherein the second artifact is used to obtain the identity assertion information, wherein the third application is a member of the plurality of applications (col. 2 lines 12-36 – “network device in response to this message from the end user device sends a response message to the end user device containing the access control information to be conveyed to the another network device”).

Regarding claims 28 and 42, Cheng et al., discloses the method wherein

- receiving the second artifact and request for the identity assertion information from a third application, wherein the third application receives the second artifact from the second application (col. 2 lines 12-36 – “network device in response to this message from the end user device sends a response message to the end user device containing the access control information to be conveyed to the another network device”);

[Examiner's Reasoning: The Examiner understands the disclosed network devices to comprise a plurality of servers (applications) as suggested and specified by the claims of Cheng (claims 25-28).]

- verifying the validity of the second artifact upon receipt from the third application (col. 6 lines 53-59 – “the authentication front end 22, after successful validation, generates an MDSSO cookie and sends this back to the user in the header portion of a message which also redirects the user's browser to access the server's MDSSO function 24”);
- retrieving, upon successful validation, the identity assertion information for the user using the second artifact (col. 1 lines 52-60 – “sending credit card information, street address, telephone number, social security number, bank details, personal health information, taxation data, criminal records, etc. from one sever to another”);
- sending the identity assertion information to the third application, wherein the third application uses the identity assertion information to authorize the user to access the third application (col. 2 lines 1-12 – “The invention, in accordance with one broad aspect, provides a method of conveying access control information, including but not limited to cookies, identification, authentication, authorization and privilege information from one network device to another network device through an end user device, for example in a system in which two servers and an end user device are all connected to the Internet, optionally after performing an

authentication on an initial access request in the event the network device is the first accesses. The method starts after the one network device receives a message from the end user device”);

- rendering the second artifact invalid for future use by any of the plurality of applications (col. 7 lines 9-11 – “the cookie may also have an expiry date”);
- receiving a request for a third artifact from the second application (col. 10 lines – “further servers, a chain of servers being identified previously” which can continue the processes initiated by SERVER_1 and SERVER_2. The third server or application is indicated by the above citation.);
- providing the third artifact associated with the identity assertion information, wherein the third artifact is used to obtain the identity assertion information (col. 2 lines 12-36 – “network device in response to this message from the end user device sends a response message to the end user device containing the access control information to be conveyed to the another network device”);
- sending the identity assertion information to the second application, wherein the third application uses the identity assertion information to authorize the user to access the third application (col. 5 lines 4-15 – “response message being adapted to cause the end user device to send a second message to the another network device containing at least part of

the user-specific information after presenting an option to the end user device the second message has a header portion and a content portion and the second message contains the at least part of the user specific information embedded within its content portion");

- rendering the second artifact invalid for future use by any of the plurality of applications (col. 4 lines 51-60 – “it is noted that the information provided to an end user device by an initial network device may be a superset of the access control information contained in the response message”); and
- receiving a request for a third artifact from the second application (col. 1 lines 52-60 – “sending credit card information, street address, telephone number, social security number, bank details, personal health information, taxation data, criminal records, etc. from one sever to another”); and
- providing the third artifact associated with the identity assertion information, wherein the third artifact is used to obtain the identity assertion information, wherein the third application is a member of the plurality of applications (col. 2 lines 12-36 – “network device in response to this message from the end user device sends a response message to the end user device containing the access control information to be conveyed to the another network device”);

[Examiner's Reasoning: The Examiner understands the disclosed network devices to comprise a plurality of servers (applications) as suggested and specified by the claims of Cheng (claims 25-28).]

Regarding claim 29 and 43, Cheng et al., discloses the method wherein the identity assertion information is stored in the central server (Figure 1 element 20).

Regarding claim 30 and 44, Cheng et al., discloses the method wherein the first artifact comprises a type code, a source identification, and an assertion identification (col. 1 lines 52-60 – “sending credit card information, street address, telephone number, social security number, bank details, personal health information, taxation data, criminal records, etc. from one sever to another”); sending the first artifact to the first application (col. 1 lines 52-60 – “sending credit card information, street address, telephone number, social security number, bank details, personal health information, taxation data, criminal records, etc. from one sever to another”).

Regarding claim 31 and 45, Cheng et al., discloses the method wherein the first artifact further comprises a server identification (col.1 lines 47-50 – “user-specific information ... personal data ... pertaining to a user”).

Regarding claim 33 and 47, Cheng et al., discloses the method wherein the user name and the user password are obtained by the first application from a web browser (col. 1 line 15 – “web-browser”) and col.1 lines 47-50 – “user-specific information ... personal data ... pertaining to a user”).

Claim 34 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 27, as claim 34 is a system implementation of the method of claim 27.

Claim 35 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 28 and 42, as claim 35 comprises similar limitations claim 28 and 42.

Claim 37 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 30, as claim 37 is a system implementation of the method of claim 30.

Claim 38 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 31 and 45, as claim 38 comprises similar limitations claim 31 and 45.

Claim 40 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 33 and 47, as claim 40 comprises similar limitations claim 33 and 47.

Claim 41 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 27, as claim 41 is a computer readable memory comprising program instructions implementation of the method of claim 27.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Art Unit: 2136

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 32, 36, 39, and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng et al. (US Patent No. 7,010,582 B1) in view of Botz et al. (US Patent Application No. 2003/0177388 A1).

Regarding claim 32, 36 and 46, Cheng et al., Cheng et al. is silent in disclosing the method as described in Claim I, wherein said assertion information and said plurality of artifacts substantially comply with a Security Assertions Markup Language (SAML) standard, and said network of trusted partner sites facilitates web browser single sign-on capabilities using interoperational protocols substantially complying with said SAML standard, however Botz et al. does disclose such a method (0066 of Botz et al. – “ITTs and ITTRs could be stored as published XML documents which could be stored further implemented using the Security Assertion Markup Language (SAML), which is a proposed standard.”).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, the have been motivated to combine the system and method for providing interactions between multiple servers and an end

user with the authentication identity translation within a multiple computing unit environment of Botz et al. Cheng hints towards the possible benefit of such a combination in the recitation of the need for a "some standard data format should be agreed upon to pass the information from site to site. Furthermore, preferably this passing of confidential information should be done in a secure fashion, by using some sort of cryptographic means for example (col. 11 lines 47-52)." Botz et al. provides motivation for the combination in the description of, "the emerging web services computing model, [in which] the various AIT logical processes e.g., Domain Controller and interface services could be implemented as published and subscribed to web accessible services. Likewise, ITTs and ITTRs could be stored as published XML documents which could be further implemented using the Security Assertion Markup Language (SAML), which is a proposed standard." Clearly there is motivation and benefit to modify the invention of Cheng towards compliance with a technology, namely SAML which is a proposed standard.

Claim 39 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 32, as claim 39 is a system implementation of the method of claim 32.

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHINWENDU C. OKORONKWO whose telephone number is (571)272-2662. The examiner can normally be reached on MWF 2:30 - 6:00, TR 9:00-3:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nasser Moazzami can be reached on (571) 272 4195. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2136

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/C. C. O./
Examiner, Art Unit 2436
October 10, 2008

/Carl Colin/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2436
October 14, 2008